REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 35-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0091990 to Little et al. ("*Little*"). Claims 35-54 have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot.

Section 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,699,310 to Garloff et al. ("*Garloff*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Garloff* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in Claims 1-34. For example, *Garloff* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 1:

> accessing a plurality of domain rules for a military theory, each domain rule being invariant, the plurality of domain rules comprising a plurality of military theory domain rules setting an objective to destroy an enemy's combat forces;
>
> displaying a plurality of business rules for the military theory, each business rule being variable, the plurality of business rules comprising a plurality of rules of engagement.

Garloff discloses rules for generating source code:

> The inheritance engine obtains the objects from the Design Knowledge Bases and the Specifications Knowledge Bases, and uses Generation Rules from the Generation Knowledge Bases ***to create source code***. The Knowledge Bases contain the rules and specifications needed ***to generate source code***. The Design Knowledge Base contains class libraries and process models which drive the specification process. The Specification Knowledge Base contains the objects used in the generated application, and the Generation Knowledge Base contains the rules needed ***to generate source code*** from the specifications.

(*Garloff*, col. 3, lines 25-35.) That is, the *Garloff* rules are for generating source code, but are neither invariant military theory domain rules setting an objective to destroy an enemy's combat forces nor variable rules of engagement. Accordingly, *Garloff* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above elements of Claim 1.

Garloff also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the following elements recited in amended independent Claim 21:

> identifying military theory rules required by the laws as a plurality of domain rules of the military theory, each domain rule being invariant;
>
> designating the other military theory rules as a plurality of business rules of the military theory, the business rules comprising a plurality of rules engagement, each business rule being variable.

As discussed above, *Garloff* discloses rules for generating source code. *Garloff* also describes three knowledge bases, where the first contains libraries and models, the second contains specifications, and the third contains rules and directions:

> FIG. 1B shows the three knowledge bases used with the present invention. It uses three types of logical knowledge bases: the Design Knowledge Base, the Specification Knowledge Base, and the Generation Knowledge Base. The Design Knowledge Base contains the Class ***Libraries*** and Process ***Models*** that the Developer uses to create the specifications for his program. The Specification Knowledge Base contains the Developer's ***specifications***. The Generation Knowledge Base contains the ***rules*** and ***directions*** for generating source code from the specifications.

(*Garloff*, col. 3, lines 38-47.) *Garloff* also describes changing a list of knowledge bases:

> FIG. 3 is a flow chart of the process used to change the list of Knowledge Bases.

(*Garloff*, col. 9, lines 32-34.) *Garloff*, however, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above elements of Claim 21.

For at least these reasons, independent Claims 1 and 21 and their dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. For analogous reasons, independent Claims 7, 13, 19, 20, 25, 29, 33, and 34 and their respective dependent claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

Correspondence Address:
Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494
Date: July 15, 2008

Customer Number: 05073